

VALENTI LAW APC

Matthew D. Valenti (SBN 253978)

E-mail: mattvalenti@valentilawapc.com

5252 Balboa Avenue, Suite 700

San Diego, California 92117

Phone: (619) 540-2189

Attorney for Raul Uriarte-Limon

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAUL URIARTE-LIMON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PHRESH WATERS LLC; LEONARDO
GONZALEZ; and DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No.:

COMPLAINT FOR:

DENIAL OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND
ACCESS TO PUBLIC FACILITIES
TO PHYSICALLY DISABLED
PERSONS IN VIOLATION OF THE
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES
ACT OF 1990, (42 U.S.C. §12101, *et*
seq.) AND THE UNRUH CIVIL
RIGHTS ACT, (CALIFORNIA CIVIL
CODE §51, *et seq.*)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

“[T]he continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous.” 42 U.S.C. §12101(a)(8).

“It is the policy of this state to encourage and enable individuals with a disability to participate fully in the social and economic life of the state ...”
California Government Code §19230(a).

Plaintiff RAUL URIARTE-LIMON (hereinafter referred to as “Plaintiff”) complains of PHRESH WATERS LLC a California limited liability company dba DOWNEY WATERS; LEONARDO GONZALEZ, an individual and Trustee of the GONZALEZ 2015 REVOCABLE TRUST; and DOES 1-10, (each, individually a “Defendant” and collectively “Defendants”) and alleges as follows:

I. PARTIES

1. Plaintiff RAUL URIARTE-LIMON is a California resident and a qualified physically disabled person. He cannot walk due to paraplegia and uses a wheelchair for mobility. Plaintiff prides himself on his independence and on empowering other disabled persons to be independent.

2. Defendants PHRESH WATERS LLC, LEONARDO GONZALEZ, and DOES 1-10 are and were the owners, operators, lessors and/or lessees of the subject business, property, and facility at all times relevant in this Complaint.

3. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to

1 amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the
2 Defendants and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

3 4. Defendants own and owned the property located at 8800 Imperial
4 Highway, Downey, CA 90242 (“Subject Property”) at all relevant times.

5 5. Defendants operate and operated a water store doing business as
6 DOWNEY WATERS (“water store”), located at the Subject Property, at all
7 relevant times.

8 6. Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants have been and are the owners,
9 franchisees, lessees, general partners, limited partners, agents, trustees, employees,
10 subsidiaries, partner companies and/or joint ventures of each of the other
11 Defendants, and performed all acts and omissions stated herein within the course
12 and scope of such relationships causing the damages complained of herein.

13 II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14 7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
15 28 U.S.C. §1331 and §1343(a)(3) and (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with
16 Disabilities Act of 1990, U.S.C. §12101, *et seq.*

17 8. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause
18 of action, arising out of the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the
19 same transactions, is also brought under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act,
20 which expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

21 9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. U.S.C. §1391(b)
22 and is founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action
23 is located in this district and that Plaintiff’s causes of action arose in this district.

24 III. FACTS

25 10. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility.

26 11. Defendants’ business is open to the public, a place of public
27 accommodation, and a business establishment.
28

1 12. Plaintiff went to the water store on May 16, 2024, and purchased a
2 water pump. The receipt he received for his purchase is shown in the photo below.



13. Unfortunately, during Plaintiff's visit, Defendants did not offer
persons with disabilities equivalent facilities, privileges, advantages, and
accommodations offered to other persons.

14. Plaintiff encountered barriers that interfered with and denied Plaintiff
the ability to use and enjoy the goods, services, privileges, advantages, and
accommodations offered by Defendants at the Subject Property.

1 15. These barriers violate one or more standards of the Americans with
2 Disabilities Act (“2010 ADA”) and/or the California Building Codes (“2022
3 CBC”).

4 16. Parking for patrons visiting the Subject Property is among the
5 facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations offered by Defendants.

6 17. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, “a public
7 accommodation’s first priority should be to enable individuals with disabilities to
8 physically enter its facility. This priority on ‘getting through the door’ recognizes
9 that providing physical access to a facility from public sidewalks, public
10 transportation, or parking is generally preferable to any alternative arrangements in
11 terms of both business efficiency and the dignity of individuals with disabilities.”
12 ADA Title III Technical Assistance Manual §III-4.4500.

13 18. When parking is provided, there must be at least one accessible
14 parking space designated and marked for disabled persons. Where more than one
15 parking facility is provided on a site, the number of accessible spaces provided on
16 the site shall be calculated according to the number of spaces required for each
17 parking facility. 2010 ADA §502 et seq.; 2010 ADA §208.2; 2022 CBC 11B-502
18 et seq; 2022 CBC 11B-208.2.

19 19. However, there is no accessible parking for disabled persons at the
20 Subject Property because there are insufficient accessible parking spaces
21 designated for disabled persons and/or the existing ostensibly designated space or
22 spaces are significantly noncompliant with the applicable ADA and CBC
23 standards.

24 20. It appears there was once a designated accessible parking space and
25 adjacent access aisle, but Defendants have failed to maintain the paint and it is now
26 entirely or almost entirely deteriorated and worn away. There is no way to
27 determine the actual dimensions of the space and whether the ostensible access
28 aisle is the correct width for an accessible space. The “No Parking” and

International Access Symbol is completely missing. ADA 2010 §502.3.3; ADA 2010 §502.6; 2022 CBC 11B-502.3.3; 2022 CBC 11B 502.6; 28 C.F.R. §36.211(a); 2022 CBC 11B-108.

21. The ostensibly designated accessible parking space's adjacent access aisle did not say "No Parking," or the paint is so deteriorated it cannot be clearly identified. ADA 2010 §502.3.3; 2022 CBC 11B-502.3.3; 28 C.F.R. §36.211(a); 2022 CBC 11B-108.

22. The ground surface of the ostensibly designated accessible parking spaces and their access aisles was severely cracked, broken and uneven. ADA 2010 §302; 2022 CBC 11B-302; 28 C.F.R. §36.211(a); 2022 CBC 11B-108.

23. There is no sign in a conspicuous place at the entrance to the facility, or immediately adjacent to on-site accessible parking and visible from each parking space, stating that vehicles parked in designated accessible spaces not displaying a disabled placard or license plate will be towed. 2022 CBC 11B-502.8.

24. The photos below show one or more of these violations.



1 25. The barriers existed during Plaintiff's visit to the Subject Property.
2 Plaintiff personally encountered these barriers.

3 26. These inaccessible conditions and barriers denied Plaintiff full and
4 equal access and caused him difficulty, discomfort, and embarrassment. Because of
5 the lack of compliant parking and compliant access aisle, Plaintiff was placed at
6 risk of being blocked in by other vehicles and unable to get out of his vehicle or get
7 back into it. He was also at greater risk of being hit by a car while transferring to
8 and from his wheelchair. Because of the severely cracked and broken ground
9 surface, Plaintiff had more difficulty traversing the ground and was at risk of
10 getting stuck in his wheelchair or tipping over on his way to and from the entrance
11 of the store.

12 27. These barriers denied Plaintiff full and equal access due to his
13 disability because, *inter alia*, they caused Plaintiff anxiety, difficulty, discomfort,
14 and embarrassment which patrons who do not use a wheelchair for mobility do not
15 suffer when they access the Subject Property.

16 28. Plaintiff intends to return to the Subject Property in the near future.
17 Plaintiff is currently deterred from returning because of the knowledge of the
18 barriers to equal access that relate to Plaintiff's disabilities which continue to exist
19 at Defendants' public accommodation facilities. Plaintiff is proud to be an ADA
20 tester who engages in the "necessary and desirable" task of bringing serial lawsuits
21 in order to ensure that the accessibility standards of Title III of the ADA are
22 enforced. (The Ninth Circuit has repeatedly commented that "it may be necessary
23 and desirable for committed individuals to bring serial litigation advancing the
24 time when public accommodations will be compliant with the ADA. . . .[A] system
25 that relies on private attorneys general should respect and value the work done by
26 those who take up the mantle . . . rather than expecting every disabled person to
27 use whatever spare time and energy they have to litigate each trip to the movies."
28 *Langer v. Kiser*, 57 F.4th 1085, 1095, 1099 (9th Cir. 2023) (citations omitted)).

1 29. Though Plaintiff has filed numerous cases, the total number of
2 businesses he has sued represents a very small fraction of the approximately 3
3 million public accommodations in the State of California alone which are required
4 to be accessible to disabled people pursuant to ADA and CBC standards.

5 30. As a tester, Plaintiff visits properties in part to identify potential ADA
6 and CBC violations, and revisits the properties to confirm ADA and CBC
7 compliance after any lawsuit he brings regarding the violations is resolved. He
8 therefore has a credible intent to return to the Subject Property in the near future in
9 order to accomplish this task, and in the meantime is also currently deterred from
10 returning because of the knowledge of the barriers to equal access that relate to his
11 disabilities which continue to exist at the Subject Property. This accords with well-
12 settled Ninth Circuit precedent which provides that a Title III ADA tester such as
13 Plaintiff has Article III standing because “visiting a property to identify potential
14 ADA violations is consistent with having a credible intent to return.” See, e.g.,
15 *Langer v. Kiser*, at 1096 (citations omitted); See also, *Civil Rights Education and*
16 *Enforcement Center v. Hospitality Properties Trust* (“CREEC”), 867 F.3d 1093
17 (9th Cir. 2017).

18 31. Plaintiff also has Article III standing because, in addition to visiting
19 the Subject Property to test for ADA and CBC violations, he also visited to
20 purchase a water pump. The Subject Property is conveniently located and in the
21 general area where he lives, shops, goes to medical appointments, visits family and
22 friends, recreates, and does other normal activities in his daily life. Therefore, in
23 addition to his concrete plan to return to the Subject Property to test for ADA and
24 CBC compliance, Plaintiff also intends to return to the Subject Property in the near
25 future to make another purchase, after the accessibility barriers alleged herein have
26 been removed.

27 32. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants knew that the barriers prevented
28 equal access. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants had actual or constructive

1 knowledge that the architectural barriers prevented equal access, and that the
2 noncompliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Title 24 of the
3 California Building Code regarding accessible features was intentional.

4 33. Defendants have obstructed or failed to maintain, in working and
5 useable conditions, those features necessary to provide ready access to persons
6 with disabilities. “A public accommodation shall maintain in operable working
7 condition those features of facilities and equipment that are required to be readily
8 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities.” 28 C.F.R. §36.211(a); 2022
9 CBC 11B-108.

10 34. The State of California Department of General Servicers, Division of
11 the State Architect (DSA) provides commentary to 2022 CBC 11B-108 as follows:

12 Features for accessibility must be permanently functional, unobstructed
13 and may not be removed. It is not sufficient to provide features such as
14 accessible routes, parking, elevators, ramps or signage if those features
15 are not maintained in a manner that enables individuals with disabilities
to use them.

16 DSA, 2019 California Access Compliance Advisory Reference Manual, p.84.

17 35. Defendants have the financial resources to remove these barriers
18 without much expense or difficulty in order to make their property more accessible
19 to their mobility impaired customers. The United States Department of Justice has
20 identified that these types of barriers are readily achievable to remove.

21 36. To date, Defendants refuse to remove these barriers, in violation of
22 the law, willfully depriving disabled persons including Plaintiff of important civil
23 rights.

24 37. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants’
25 failure to remove these barriers was intentional because the barriers are logical and
26 obvious. During all relevant times Defendants had authority, control, and dominion
27 over these conditions and therefore the absence of accessible facilities was not a
28 mishap, but rather an intentional act.

1 38. The barriers to access are listed above without prejudice to Plaintiff
2 citing additional barriers to equal access by an amended complaint after inspection
3 by Plaintiff's Certified Access Specialist (CAsp). *Oliver v. Ralphs Grocery Co.*,
4 654 F.3d 903 (9th Cir. 2011); *Doran v. 7-Eleven, Inc.*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir.
5 2008); *Chapman v. Pier One Imports (USA), Inc.*, 631 F.3d 939 (9th Cir. 2011).
6 All of these barriers to access render the premises inaccessible to physically
7 disabled persons who are mobility impaired, such as Plaintiff, are barriers Plaintiff
8 may encounter when he returns to the premises. All public accommodations must
9 be brought into compliance with all applicable federal and state accessibility
10 requirements.

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 Violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990

13 (42 U.S.C. §12101, *et seq.*)

14 (Against All Defendants)

15 39. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth
16 again herein, each and every allegation contained in all prior paragraphs of this
17 complaint.

18 40. More than thirty years ago, the 101st United States Congress found
19 that although "physical or mental disabilities in no way diminish a person's right to
20 fully participate in all aspects of society, yet many people with physical or mental
21 disabilities have been precluded from doing so because of discrimination...in such
22 critical areas as employment, housing, public accommodations, education,
23 transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services,
24 voting, and access to public services." 42 U.S.C. §12101(a).

25 41. In 1990 Congress also found that "the Nation's proper goals regarding
26 individuals with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation,
27 independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for such individuals," but that
28 "the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice

1 denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to
2 pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous.” 42
3 U.S.C. §12101(a).

4 42. In passing the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, which was
5 signed into law by President George H. W. Bush on July 26, 1990 (hereinafter the
6 “ADA”), Congress stated as its purpose:

7 “It is the purpose of this Act

8 (1) to provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the
9 elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;

10 (2) to provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards
11 addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities;

12 (3) to ensure that the Federal Government plays a central role in
13 enforcing the standards established in this Act on behalf of individuals
14 with disabilities; and

15 (4) to invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power
16 to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in
17 order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day to-day by
18 people with disabilities.”

19 42 USC §12101(b).

20 43. As part of the ADA, Congress passed “Title III – Public
21 Accommodations and Services Operated by Private Entities” (42 U.S.C. §12181 *et*
22 *seq.*). Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination against any person “on the
23 basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities,
24 privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation
25 by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public
26 accommodation.” 42 U.S.C. §12182(a).

27 44. The specific prohibitions against discrimination include, *inter alia*, the
28 following:

- 1 • 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(1)(A)(ii): “Participation in Unequal Benefit. - It
2 shall be discriminatory to afford an individual or class of individuals,
3 on the basis of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class,
4 directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, with
5 the opportunity to participate in or benefit from a good, service, facility,
6 privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is not equal to that
7 afforded to other individuals.”
- 8 • 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(ii): “a failure to make reasonable
9 modifications in policies, practices, or procedures when such
10 modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities,
11 privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with
12 disabilities...;”
- 13 • 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(iii): “a failure to take such steps as may be
14 necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded,
15 denied service, segregated, or otherwise treated differently than other
16 individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services...;”
- 17 • 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(iv): “a failure to remove architectural
18 barriers, and communication barriers that are structural in nature, in
19 existing facilities... where such removal is readily achievable;”
- 20 • 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(v): “where an entity can demonstrate that
21 the removal of a barrier under clause (iv) is not readily achievable, a
22 failure to make such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages,
23 or accommodations available through alternative methods if such
24 methods are readily achievable.”

25 45. Plaintiff is a qualified individual with a disability as defined in the
26 Rehabilitation Act and in the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

27 46. The acts and omissions of Defendants set forth herein were in
28 violation of Plaintiff’s rights under the ADA and the regulations promulgated
thereunder, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 *et seq.*

47. The removal of each of the physical and policy barriers complained of
by Plaintiff as hereinabove alleged, were at all times herein mentioned “readily
achievable” under the standards of §12181 and §12182 of the ADA. Removal of

1 each and every one of the architectural and/or policy barriers complained of herein
2 was already required under California law. Further, on information and belief,
3 alterations, structural repairs or additions since January 26, 1993, have also
4 independently triggered requirements for removal of barriers to access for disabled
5 persons per §12183 of the ADA. In the event that removal of any barrier is found
6 to be “not readily achievable,” Defendants still violated the ADA, per
7 §12182(b)(2)(A)(v) by failing to provide all goods, services, privileges, advantages
8 and accommodations through alternative methods that were “readily achievable.”

9 48. On information and belief, as of the date of Plaintiff’s encounter at the
10 premises and as of the filing of this Complaint, Defendants’ actions, policies, and
11 physical premises have denied and continue to deny full and equal access to
12 Plaintiff and to other mobility disabled persons in other respects, which violate
13 Plaintiff’s right to full and equal access and which discriminate against Plaintiff on
14 the basis of his disabilities, thus wrongfully denying to Plaintiff the full and equal
15 enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and
16 accommodations, in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182 and §12183 of the ADA.

17 49. Defendants’ actions continue to deny Plaintiff’s rights to full and
18 equal access and discriminated and continue to discriminate against him on the
19 basis of his disabilities, thus wrongfully denying to Plaintiff the full and equal
20 enjoyment of Defendants’ goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and
21 accommodations, in violation of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12182.

22 50. Further, each and every violation of the Americans With Disabilities
23 Act of 1990 also constitutes a separate and distinct violation of California Civil
24 Code §51(f), §52, §54(c) and §54.1(d), thus independently justifying an award of
25 damages and injunctive relief pursuant to California law, including but not limited
26 to Civil Code §54.3 and §55.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act

(California Civil Code §51, *et seq.*)

(Against All Defendants)

51. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, each and every allegation contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

52. California Civil Code §51 provides that physically disabled persons are free and equal citizens of the state, regardless of their medical condition or disability:

All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, **disability, or medical condition** are entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.

California Civil Code §51(b) (emphasis added).

53. California Civil Code §51.5 also states, in part: “No business, establishment of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against...any person in this state on account” of their disability.

54. California Civil Code §51(f) specifically incorporates (by reference) an individual’s rights under the ADA into the Unruh Act.

55. California Civil Code §52 provides that the discrimination by Defendants against Plaintiff on the basis of his disability constitutes a violation of the general antidiscrimination provisions of §51 and §52.

56. Each of Defendants’ discriminatory acts or omissions constitutes a separate and distinct violation of California Civil Code §52, which provides that:

Whoever denies, aids or incites a denial, or makes any discrimination or distinction contrary to section 51, 51.5, or 51.6 is liable for each and every offense for the actual damages, and any amount that may be determined by a jury, or a court sitting without a jury, up to a maximum

1 of three times the amount of actual damage but in no case less than four
2 thousand dollars (\$4,000), and any attorney's fees that may be
3 determined by the court in addition thereto, suffered by any person
4 denied the rights provided in Section 51, 51.5, or 51.6.

5 57. Any violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
6 constitutes a violation of California Civil Code §51(f), thus independently
7 justifying an award of damages and injunctive relief pursuant to California law,
8 including Civil Code §52. Per Civil Code §51(f), "A violation of the right of any
9 individual under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-
10 336) shall also constitute a violation of this section."

11 58. The actions and omissions of Defendants as herein alleged constitute a
12 denial of access to and use of the described public facilities by physically disabled
13 persons within the meaning of California Civil Code §51 and §52.

14 59. The discriminatory denial of equal access to and use of the described
15 public facilities caused Plaintiff difficulty, discomfort, and embarrassment.

16 60. As a proximate result of Defendants' action and omissions,
17 Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of Civil Code §51 and
18 §52, and are responsible for statutory, compensatory and actual damages to
19 Plaintiff, according to proof.

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law to redress the wrongs suffered as set
22 forth in this Complaint. Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer
23 irreparable injury as a result of the unlawful acts, omissions, policies, and
24 practices of the Defendants as alleged herein, unless Plaintiff is granted the relief
25 he requests. Plaintiff and Defendants have an actual controversy and opposing
26 legal positions as to Defendants' violations of the laws of the United States and
27 the State of California.
28

1 The need for relief is critical because the civil rights at issue are paramount
2 under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California.

3 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, and each of
4 them, as follows:

5 1. Issue a preliminary and permanent injunction directing
6 Defendants as current owners, operators, lessors, and/or lessees of the
7 Subject Property and premises to modify the above described property,
8 premises, policies and related facilities to provide full and equal access
9 to all persons, including persons with physical disabilities; and issue a
10 preliminary and permanent injunction pursuant to ADA §12188(a) and
11 state law directing Defendants to provide facilities and services usable
12 by Plaintiff and similarly situated persons with disabilities, and which
13 provide full and equal access, as required by law, and to maintain such
14 accessible facilities once they are provided; to cease any discriminatory
15 policies; and to train Defendants' employees and agents how to
16 recognize disabled persons and accommodate their rights and needs;

17 2. Retain jurisdiction over the Defendants until such time as
18 the Court is satisfied that Defendants' unlawful policies, practices, acts
19 and omissions, and maintenance of physically inaccessible public
20 facilities and policies as complained of herein no longer occur, and
21 cannot recur;

22 3. Award to Plaintiff all appropriate damages, including but
23 not limited to actual and statutory damages according to proof;

24 4. Award to Plaintiff all reasonable attorney fees, litigation
25 expenses, and costs of this proceeding pursuant to 42 U.S.C §12205 and
26 California Civil Code §52; and

27 5. Grant such other and further relief as this Court may deem
28 just and proper.

DATED: November 14, 2024

VALENTI LAW APC

By: /s/ Matthew D. Valenti

Matthew D. Valenti
Attorney for Plaintiff
Raul Uriarte-Limon

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury for all claims and issues for which a jury is permitted.

DATED: November 14, 2024

VALENTI LAW APC

By: /s/ Matthew D. Valenti

Matthew D. Valenti
Attorney for Plaintiff
Raul Uriarte-Limon